

65 64

MORE WORK

FOR

DR. WARREN,

IN

FIFTEEN QUESTIONS,

PROPOSED BY

MR. WILLIAM DAWSON,

Of Barnbow, near Leeds.

TO WHICH IS ADDED

A LETTER

TO

THE EDITOR OF THE MANCHESTER CHRONICLE,

BY THE

REV. JOSHUA MARSDEN.

MANCHESTER:

SOLD BY J. E. STOREY, MARKET-STREET.

1834.

BW 401
D3 M6

J. Thompson (late Everett and Thompson), Printer,
30, New Cannon-st., Manchester.

Wes. 1519

TO

SAMUEL WARREN, LL. D.

DEAR DOCTOR,

As your case and conduct raise such great excitement in many bosoms, I assure you, I feel a considerable share in my own heart; and it excites some interesting inquiries in my mind, which I cannot resolve so comfortably to my own wishes as I could like. No doubt but you can,—*your age—your piety—your talents*, as especially your *title* of LL. D. will very readily do it. I can answer some of my own questions promptly and categorically, but perhaps they are not the same as you will give. I will, therefore, seriously and religiously give you my own queries and answers.—Query 1st.: Do *innocency, justice, and truth* shrink and run away from the investigation of their principles or practice? I answer, Never!—What is your's, Doctor?—Query 2nd.: Do not *innocency, justice, and truth*, when suspected, always *court* inquiry; nay, peremptorily demand it? I answer, Always!—What reply do you make, Doctor?—Query 3rd.: When you was summoned by your brethren to give an account of your principles and practice in publishing your pamphlet, did you *court* inquiry? Did you stand before your brethren with holy confidence, because your principles and practices were surrounded by the halo of glory which always rests upon the brow of *innocency, justice, and truth*? I answer, Yes: you stood *for a while*, but afterwards slunk away! I suppose, Doctor, *your* reply will be nearly the same?—Query 4th.: Why did you retire from the investigation, when you knew that *innocency, justice, and truth* always come from the furnace of the severest trial like “gold seven times purified?” I cannot answer this question to my own satisfaction. What do you say, Doctor? I suppose you will

reply, "Because my friend Bromley was commanded to retire, therefore I thought it my duty to retire also." Very well.—But 5thly: Would Mr. B.'s presence have made any alteration in the *nature* and essence of the justice and truth of your cause? Two and two make four, and can any man make them more or less? I answer, They cannot. What is your answer, Doctor? I presume it will be, "When Mr. Bromley retired, I had not *another friend* in court; and therefore I retired also." Very well.—6thly: Did St. Paul *run away* from his trial, because he had not one human friend in the court? No. He stood alone, with all the composure of perfect self possession, because he had justice and truth on his side; and you know, when he writes to Timothy, and gives an account of his trial, he says, "Though all men forsook me, the Lord stood with me and *strengthened me*." Dear Doctor, when Mr. B. was gone, did the *Lord also go with him*, and leave his innocent servant Warren both *defenceless* and *strengthless* before his brethren? You can best answer that question.—Therefore, 7thly: If you were convinced that you had justice and truth on your side, could you not have stood *single handed*, not only before a District Meeting of your *brethren*, but before the clamours of an accusing world? I answer, Yes! What is your reply, Doctor?—Then I ask again, 8thly: What scriptural account can you give for escaping from investigation? I cannot find *one*. Perhaps you may find many.

I have thought that if a similar case had happened amongst the officers of a regiment of the British Army (though I do not say that the cases between the Army and the Church of Christ are exactly parallel, yet I may fairly use it as an illustration),—supposing a Captain in a regiment had vilified and slandered the character of some of his brother officers, and had treated with derision their deliberations and decisions upon a certain important point, of establishing an institution to improve the qualifications of the junior officers when they entered into the lists and joined the regiment; and the Captain also wrote a very inflammatory appeal to the Serjeants and Corporals, and every common soldier in the ranks, and called upon them to oppose their officers;—I ask, 9thly: Would the officers in that regiment have done wrong in calling such a Captain to a *Court Martial* to investigate the case, and desire him to vindicate himself? I think every person would say, No.

10thly: But supposing, at the court martial, an officer from a considerable distance, who had no legal right to be there, but was admitted by pure courtesy to be a mere *spectator* and *hearer*; but when this gentleman entered the room, he sat down and immediately took a very officious and improper *interference* in the case of the Captain, and when the officers wished him to be still, and desired him to take his place, where a *spectator* and a *hearer*

ought to be, this officious gentleman breathed out a fiery dart of the most wounding reflection upon his brother officers, and called their conduct "*consummately cruel*." I ask, was this proper language to come out of the mouth of a person who had *no right to be there* ! but by the kindness of those very officers whose conduct he was libelling as being "*consummately cruel*?" I answer, the conduct of the answer of that gentleman would have been equally improper? What do you say, Doctor?

11thly : Supposing the officers had interfered, and said that as their brother had taken such improper liberties to interfere in a case where he had no legitimate right, and also to cast reflections upon them so "*consummately cruel*," they begged therefore that he would *entirely withdraw* ; would any one have blamed them ? I presume to answer, No. What would have been your views of such a case ?

12thly : If when the over-officious and hard-judging brother had retired, the Captain also *withdrew with him*, what would the officers have concluded by such conduct ? I think they would have expressed their fears that the Captain *must be guilty*, or he would never have insulted the court and thus slunk away from his trial. I think such a conclusion quite natural ! Perhaps, Doctor, you do not.

13thly : But if the court deputed some officers to go to the Captain and beg that he would stand the investigation, and meet them the *next day*, and assure him that if he was clear he had no grounds to fear ; that "*great was truth and would prevail* ;" but the Captain still poured contempt upon the *Court* and the Deputation ;—was it improper, nay, was it not kind, in the officers, after he appeared *incorrigible*, to suspend him *a month* from the exercise of the functions of his office, in order that he might have time to deliberate upon the subject ? I think every one would have approved of the conduct of the officers ! Perhaps, Doctor, you will think different.

14thly : If in the interval of the month, instead of seriously and silently considering the subject, and at the end of the term, coming with humble boldness to meet his brethren (as an innocent injured man would do), he filled up that interval by holding seditious meetings and disseminating the most inflammatory speeches and principles to the soldiers ; and told them that he was their Captain still ; that he was appointed by the King and his name regularly gazetted ; that the court-martial could not suspend him ; and he earnestly called upon every man in the regiment to make common cause with him against their officers as deep and downright tyrants ;—would not any man in the British army have thought that, if he did not ask pardon and promise amendment, he richly deserved to be cashiered ? Would not Dr. Warren think so ?

15thly : But supposing the suspended Captain, *who durst not stand his trial*, took it upon him also to *legislate* for the whole British army ; and introduce perfectly new rules and regulations, which will subvert the principles of the discipline of the army, and injure its unity, harmony, and strength : I ask, would *such a Captain* be the most *proper man to legislate* in such a case ? I answer emphatically, *No !* Is that a proper man *to make laws* for others, who breaks all law himself ? I again repeat it, *No !* He is certainly the most *improper man in the world* for such a work. Perhaps on this point you will think different. And now, Doctor, you see the bearing of the above questions as applicable to your case, and I think they deserve the most serious considerations and unambiguous answers.—O, Sir, my soul bleeds for the Church of Christ ; and when I see the *children, and members, and ministers of Methodism*, as far as they are able, thrust the sword into the bowels of *their parent*, who “ nourished and brought them up,” my soul “ weeps in secret places,” and I mourn over the men who can make the slightest approach towards that awful character for which St. Paul says the law is made, viz., “ murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers ;” and, Sir, what is to become of their children ? For Christ’s sake and souls’ sake, stop in your career of scattering, tearing, and slaying the flock of our Great Shepherd. That the wolf should do it, is not to be wondered at ; but for an *under Shepherd* to do it, is *monstrous*. Lord, save us from ourselves, is the cry of the heart of—

Yours sincerely,

W. DAWSON.

Barnbow, 16th Dec., 1834.

TO THE

EDITOR OF THE MANCHESTER CHRONICLE,

SIR,

Sometime since I learned from the public papers that a number of persons calling themselves “The Wesleyan Methodist Association,” did me the unasked and unmerited honour of a vote of thanks for what never existed, and never can exist, with my present views and feelings.

Sir, I have not the ambition, like the incendiary who burned the Temple at Ephesus, to be gibbeted to infamy. I detest schism from my very soul ; and the unauthorised insertion

of my name in a certain paper was a most dishonourable trick without my knowledge, privity, or consent. All I said at that Quarterly Meeting was (when at the end of it two or three individuals mooted the subject), that if the subject was left to lay over till the Spring quarter, I would carry any representations made by a lawful majority to the District Meeting; and there the matter rested.

Now, Sir, have I not cause to reject the vote of thanks assumed upon that bold, daring, and unauthorised use of my name? I deserve a vote of thanks for promoting the demolition of one of the finest fabrics in the world! I, who have laboured fourteen years in foreign parts to help to rear it up, and twenty-one at home to promote it! I, who have been a Wesleyan Methodist from eighteen years of age! Not a new-fangled, but a true Methodist. Sir, I abhor the thought; and I can call the Searcher of hearts to witness, that it has been as far from my thoughts

“As from the centre to the utmost pole.”

But I have no fear as to the ultimate result. Methodism has weathered many a storm, and it will weather this also. At any rate, should things come to the worst, and we have to realize that frightful conflict for which the enemies of our Zion seem to be preparing, I, for one, will nail my colours to the mast, and perish in the last wreck of Methodism, rather than strike to those who are endeavouring to sink the gallant vessel.

You may be told, Sir, that I write this to clear myself with my brethren: I have nothing to hope or fear from that quarter. I am, Sir, neither Tory nor Radical; but I love order. Besides, I owe my all to Methodism; I mean my dearest hopes, my truest comforts, and my purest light. By its Ministers I was tutored, watched, and brought to salvation. I have known some of its mighty pillars, the giants of other days. I have sat with delight under Mather, Taylor, Thompson, Hopper. I have wept at the appeals of Benson, Coke, Bradburn, and many others. I have spent my vigour in its Missionary service, have grown old and grey in its ranks, and shall I leave Methodism? Rather let my right hand forget its cunning,

“Be my tongue mute, my fancy paint no more,
And dead to joy, my heart forget to beat.”

I love its doctrines, its discipline, its ordinances, its ministry and its ministers; and there are few earthly considerations but I would rather relinquish than my name in its Society, and my ministry in its pulpits.

You will observe, Sir, that I have said nothing about the Theological Institution, that has been ably defended by others. Nothing about the unprincipled and undeserved abuse, poured so

plentifully upon the heads of many excellent Ministers of CHRIST. That speaks for itself, and is proof (if any were needed) that truth and charity have been banished from the party who wish to govern the helm of Methodism. Nothing respecting the wide, sweeping reform in perspective,—a reform utterly destructive of every vestige of the Wesleyan polity: and by whom? By men who to gain their ends would cripple our Missions, send our worn-out preachers a begging, bring ruin upon our Trustees and Chapels, desolate our schools, and deprive poor circuits of the means of having the gospel preached. But where is the end of this chain of mischief? and what do its authors contemplate? “My soul, come not thou into their secret; my honor, be not thou united to them.”

And these things are to be brought about, Sir, by slander, defamation, duplicity, backbiting, tale bearing, evil surmising, letter stealing, name forging, dishonorable espionage: “by their fruits ye shall know them.” I will conclude with an anecdote, the truth of which came under my own knowledge, and the application of it in reference to Wesleyan Methodism I shall apply to my own case.

When twenty two years ago I was detained a prisoner of war, in the city of New York, a friend of mine, a worthy Englishman, who had been in that city some years, and in good business, wished to get naturalized. He applied to the Mayor De Witt Clinton, who read to him the form as preliminary to the oath of naturalization, the preamble of which is to the following effect: —“You swear to renounce allegiance to all foreign Princes, Potentates, and powers, but especially to his Majesty King George the Third, his heirs and successors for ever.” “Stop! stop!” said the indignant old Briton; “I will rot in a jail first.”

I am, Sir, yours respectfully,

JOSHUA MARSDEN.

Sheerness, Dec. 15th, 1834.